PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program

Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 1, 2010-2011

Applicant	City of Menifee	**Amount Requested**	$8,090,617
Proposal Title	Phases 2-4 of the Homeland/Romoland Line A Master Drainage Plan	**Total Proposal Cost**	$16,181,233

PROPOSAL SUMMARY

The Project goal is to remove 1275 acres from the FEMA Zone A floodplain by constructing approximately 38,400 lineal feet (lf) of open channel and storm drains [16,400 lf from Briggs Basin to the I-215 freeway (Phase 2), and 22,000 lf from Juniper Flats Basin to San Jacinto River (Phase 4)]. The Project will also implement water quality Best Management Practices (BMP) to reduce soil erosion, recharge the local groundwater basin, and create 70 acres of parks and open space with a regional recreation trail system.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	**6/15**	Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply Benefits	**9/12**
Budget	**2/5**	Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits	**6/12**
Schedule	**3/5**	Program Preferences	**6/10**
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	**3/5**		
		Total Score (max. possible = 64)	**35**

EVALUATION SUMMARY

Work Plan

The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation and rationales are incomplete. The goals and objectives of the Project are presented, but does not relate to how they are consistent with the IRWMP. The Work Plan states that "…the Project is completely ready to place out to bid and construct." yet, plans and specifications are not submitted to demonstrate the extent of the work. Maps are included to show the general location of the Project, but the maps are vague with respect to where the proposed channels alignments, the park, and BMP implementation sites are located with respect to the floodplain (Exhibit I). The tasks in the Proposal do not provide sufficient information to explain what is being constructed. For example, Task 9.2.4 states, "Construct manholes, headwalls, and other structures." Also, the tasks do not explain what phases of the Project they are associated with. Finally, the Work Plan did not demonstrate if the phases pursuing funding in the Proposal could operate as a standalone Project. Phases 2, 3, and 4 rely on the detention basins from Phase 1.

Budget

The Budgets for less than half the projects in the Proposal have detailed cost information as described in Attachment 4. Many of the costs cannot be verified as reasonable, and supporting documentation is lacking for all of the Budget categories described in Exhibit B. The tasks in the Work Plan are categorized according to the Budget categories; however, the Budget is not broken into the specific work tasks. The proposal copies the language from the Proposition 1E PSP Exhibit B verbatim, but does not provide the detailed information required. For example, on page 1, Row (a) states that "Detail shall include hourly wage paid by discipline; number of hours to be expended for administration; and costs shown for equipment, or supplies, with back-up data provided." Yet, there was no detailed cost information such as number of hours, job classification, cost per hour, or supplies needed included in this section, or any other section of the Budget. The engineer's estimate of probable construction costs is based on a June 2008 bid for Phase 1 adjusted to 2011 construction costs, but it is not clear which items are associated with which phase of the Project.

Schedule

The schedule is not entirely consistent and reasonable. The Schedule lists the construction contract award date as December 15, 2011, and the start date of construction as February 9, 2012, but the Work Plan under "Project Timing and Phasing" states that construction is anticipated to begin in April 2012. Thus, it is unclear exactly when the construction will commence. While there is a Task 3 – Reporting in the Schedule, there are no milestones for quarterly reports, and the task is scheduled for 5 days beginning on March 20, 2013. The task for Final Design seems ambitious in that only one day will be spent verifying each of eleven design components such as the hydrology, flood plain analysis, the channel alignment, utility and road crossings, etc.

Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures

The criterion is less than fully addressed and the documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. There is no discussion about the monitoring system used to verify project performance, nor is there a discussion on how the monitoring data will be used to measure the performance in meeting the goals. Project Goal (e) is to provide flood control protection for existing public facilities and property, with the indicator being water levels in the basins, yet the target for this goal is a noticeable increase in groundwater levels near the basins. Furthermore, it is unclear how this goal would be met within the life of the Project due to dependency on large scale storm events. Some of the measurement tools and methods could have included more information. For example, Goal (a) is "Capture and Convey up to 1,785 acre-feet of annual rainfall flows (100 year frequency storm)." The measurement tools and methods for this goal are "Depth gauges at road crossings." It explains the measurement tool but not the method of measurement involved with determining if the Project achieved goal (a).

Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply Benefits

High levels of Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply benefits can be realized through this proposal; however, the quality of the analysis is partially lacking and/or supporting documentation is partially unsubstantiated. In particular, there is no formal flood depth analysis that would support the assumption of 1 foot of depth. Assumed damages per structure from stormwater events are also unverifiable. Total Net Present Value of costs is $12.67 million. Flood damage reduction benefits claimed are $92.85 million.

Economic Analysis – Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits

Average levels of Water Quality and Other benefits can be realized through this proposal; however, the quality of the analysis is partially lacking and/or supporting documentation is partially unsubstantiated. Monetary benefits for water quality and other are not claimed. Qualitative benefits are reduced silt, debris and chemicals that end up on farm fields or the San Jacinto River, Canyon Lake, and Lake Elsinore. A trail system will be constructed with the channels.

Program Preferences

The Proposal includes a project that implements multiple Program Preferences including: Include Regional Projects or Programs, Effectively Integrate Water Management Programs and Projects within Hydrologic Region, Effectively Integrate Water Management with Land Use Planning, Drought Preparedness, and Practice Integrated Flood Management. However, the Proposal demonstrates a limited degree of certainty that the Program Preferences claimed can be achieved, and lacks thorough documentation for the breadth and magnitude of the Program Preferences to be implemented.